

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-23, and 27-32 are present in this application. Claims 1, 15, and 19 are independent claims.

Claim Objection

Claims 24-26 had been objected to in the Final Office Action. As claims 24-26 are canceled, Applicants submit that the objection no longer applies.

§ 112, second paragraph, Rejection

Claims 27-29 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Advisory Action of September 11, 2008 indicates that the rejection is withdrawn.

§ 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Application Publication 2003/0215142 (Gounares). Applicants have amended claims 1, 15, and 19. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection based on the claims as amended.

Summary of the Present Invention

The present invention is directed to systems and methods for processing electronic ink, including a handwriting recognition engine and an application program. In particular, electronic ink is processed by the handwriting recognition engine to generate machine-generated objects, which are made available to the application program.

In the case of machine generated text (Fig. 8), the font size is scaled to be substantially the same as the original electronic ink. The scaling can be performed by determining the size of characters in the electronic ink (step S806) and determining a font size (step S808) based on the determined size of the characters in the electronic ink. The handwritten ink is replaced on the display by the scaled machine-generated text (step S810).

Gounares

Gounares is directed to a programming interface for entry of electronic ink (Abstract). In particular, Gounaries discloses an electronic ink counterpart to a text editing control (section “InkEdit Control,” paras 0032+, in particular para. 0036; e.g. RichEdit and RichTextBox), thus providing many of the features available for conventional text to electronic ink as well. Gounares also discloses embodiments where the electronic ink can be converted into text (para. 0037). Subsequently, Gounares provides a user interface in which displayed electronic ink may be scaled, altered in its position, size, and/or color, or have properties such as italics or bold applied (paras. 0037, 0039, 0040).

In the case of ink displayed as text, Gounares discloses that text that results from recognition may be displayed to replace the ink in the display space (para. 0041; Figs. 5 and 6).

The text that results from recognition may also be bolded, underlined, italicized, resized, etc. in a conventional manner.

Differences over Gounares

The present invention solves problems that were found to occur in systems such as Gounares particularly with respect to the results of recognition. For example, as can be seen in Fig. 5 of Gounares, the text that results from recognition of a portion of the electronic ink in the display is of a different size and spacing than the remaining electronic ink. Similarly, as can be seen in Fig. 6 of Gounares, when all electronic ink of a display space has been recognized and converted to text, the recognized text is of a different size.

The present invention represents solution to problems with respect to the results of recognition. The present invention automatically converts the recognized text to be of the same size as the original electronic ink.

To the contrary, Gounares provides editing functions for displayed electronic ink and displayed text, but does not adjust size and inter-word spacing in order to render text that is substantially equal to the original electronic ink.

Claims 1, 15, and 19 have been amended in order to clarify these differences. Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, provided a conversion to the size of the original electronic ink, the present invention provides capabilities such as interchanging a display between the recognized text and the original electronic ink (Figs. 4A, 4B, 6A, 6B, 6C), correcting recognition errors (Fig. 5), and preserving or normalizing formatting (Figs. 7A, 7B, 7C). Applicants submit that dependent claims directed to these further features are not taught or suggested in Gounares.

For example, claim 4 recites “selecting at least one object from the rendered machine-generated object” (e.g., Fig. 4A, specification at paras. 45 and 46). To the contrary, Fig. 5 of Gounares shows a portion of the display space that has been recognized and converted to text (see para. 0041) from an ink object. In other words, Gounares’ Fig. 5 shows results of selection of an ink object. As mentioned above, Fig. 5 illustrates the difference in size between an ink object and recognized and converted text, which further highlights the differences in problems addressed by the present invention and Gounares.

For at least these additional reasons, Applicants request that at least the rejection of claims 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§ 103(a) Rejection – Gounares, Geidl

Claims 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gounares in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0053084 (Geidl).

Geidl, similar to Gounares, is concerned with providing electronic ink with much of the behavior normally available with text data. Geidl also discloses a feature where an ink object maintains data needed to recreate the handwritten input as originally entered (para. 0058), and in particular needed to undo any normalization applied to the object. However, other than the ability to recreate the original handwritten input, Geidl also does not address problems associated with results of recognition of electronic ink.

Thus, at least for the reasons above for claims 1, 15, and 19, Applicants submit that Gounares and Geidl, either alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert Downs** Reg. No. 48,222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant